

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on July 19, 2006. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and interview, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The examiner objected to Figure 21, because box 540 has not been identified. The specification has been amended to fix an error, making the objection moot.

The Examiner also objected to Figure 21 because "warning signal 580" is not shown in figure 21. The Examiner should refer to the previously filed amendments to the specification, filed on December 22, 2005, where the number "580" was canceled from the cited phrase. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 16, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner complains that claim 15, as amended, and claim 27 both recite "'control means' which 'inhibits' or 'allows', respectively, establishment of communication with the vehicle traveling in a predetermined direction." Claims 15 and 28 have been amended to recite the term "inhibits" rather than "restricts" as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner argued, in the Office action, that the specification and drawings do not provide an enabling disclosure of how the control section "'restricts' or 'allows' such communications." At the personal interview, applicant pointed out the teachings of the specification, and the Examiner requested that applicant point out where the specification discusses such features in a formal response to the outstanding Office action.

Accordingly, the Applicant notes that on page 46 of the specification, it is discussed that communications with a vehicle is "inhibited" depending on the direction of the vehicle. Furthermore, on pages 18-19 of the specification, it is discussed that communication is established with a vehicle traveling in the proper lane and/or direction, and that communication is inhibited if the vehicle is traveling in the improper lane and/or

Appl. No. 10/662,707
Amdt. Dated July 27, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 28, 2006

direction. Accordingly, the specification supports the language of the claim, and one skilled in the art would be able to practice the invention based on this disclosure.

The Examiner indicated, at the interview, that because no art was cited against the claims, an allowance in the case is likely, and thus notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32758US6.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

1801 East Ninth Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: July 27, 2006